



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2022

by J E Jolly BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIH MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/D/21/3277927

52 Weir Road, London SW12 0NA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Emma Hauldren against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 21/01556/FUL, dated 19 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is for alterations to a roof to create a loft conversion using an 'L' shaped mansard extension, with three roof windows to the front slope, to provide additional residential accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Government published a revised *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) in July 2021. All references to the Framework in this decision relate to the updated document.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is found to the southern side of Weir Road which is located in a predominantly residential area of brick and tile dwellings which is characterised by mirrored pairs of older style properties that are set out in rows facing the highway, some of which have roof-lights to the front and rear.
5. No 52 Weir Road is a two-storey mid-terrace property that has a two-storey side return to the rear. The property has been divided into two residential dwellings.
6. The proposal is to construct an 'L'-shaped mansard extension to the rear roof pane and side return of the host upper-floor dwelling. There would also be three roof-lights added to the front roof pane of No 52.

7. The development is located in an established residential area. For that reason, the general principle of development on the appeal site is accepted. Moreover, the appellant has brought to my attention a number of dwellings within approximately 250m radius of the host property that have 'L'-shaped extensions to the rear of the host dwelling in support of her case. Nonetheless, I have limited details of those schemes before me, which in any event are located in different roads and streets to No 52 altogether. Therefore, I have considered the proposal on its own planning merits.
8. As such, I noticed at my site visit that a number of properties on Weir Road have roof-lights to the forward roof pane. However, I also note that on this section of Weir Road that the pitched roof panes to the rear of the dwellings are relatively unfettered. Indeed, the unencumbered roof panes provide a sense of architectural rhythm along the rear of the terrace.
9. In comparison to this relatively simple built form, the proposed development would be a flat-roofed extension of some scale and intricacy that would extend along the side return of the host dwelling. As a result, in my view, the proposal would alter the cadence of the modest roof-scape, and hence be incongruous with the immediate surrounding area.
10. Furthermore, notwithstanding without prejudice that the Council has indicated that a 'stand-alone' mansard to the rear of No 52 without a side return extension is likely to be acceptable, or that the extension would not be seen from Weir Road, the proposed development would nevertheless include bulky mansard-type windows that would be at odds with the unassuming roof panes of the host dwelling.
11. I conclude therefore, that the scale and bulk of the convoluted proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and also the host dwelling.
12. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to Policies Q2, Q5, Q8 and Q11 of the Lambeth Local Plan (2015) and the draft revised Lambeth Local Plan (2020) as supported by the guidance contained in the Lambeth Building Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2015) which say, amongst other things, that roof additions and mansards will not be supported where they would harm the architectural integrity (building form and design integrity) of the original building or its group.
13. For similar reasons, the proposal does not meet the aims of Paragraph 130 (c) of the Framework which says, amongst other things, that development should be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Other Matters

14. I acknowledge that there have been no recorded objections to the proposal. Moreover, that the appellant has a growing family in need of additional privacy and working space who would prefer to remain part of the local community and within easy reach of local schools and work. However, notwithstanding the restricted head-height of an existing bedroom or the challenges of the Covid pandemic, these considerations do not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling I have found above.

Conclusions

15. Having considered all matters raised in support of the development I find that the other considerations in this case do not clearly outweigh the harm that I have identified. Accordingly, the development is in conflict with the adopted development plan when considered as a whole, and given the above would also conflict with Policies contained within the Framework, and as there are no other material considerations that indicate a decision other than in accordance with those Policies as a whole, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J E JOLLY

INSPECTOR